

Date: Fri, 15 Oct 93 04:30:40 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #376
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 15 Oct 93 Volume 93 : Issue 376

Today's Topics:

Aircraft Certification....Federal Preemption of State Rules. (2 msgs)
 Commercial Operators Exams to be given at Hosstraders 16 Oct NH
 Getting my license. Do I want to be like this?
 Temporary ID's?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 14 Oct 93 15:09:59 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Aircraft Certification....Federal Preemption of State Rules.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

from an in-house newsletter here....also Aviation Week...

Supreme Court turns down Piper-Cleveland case - Despite FAA
intervention, the Supreme Court last week refused to hear the Piper-
Cleveland case, which "threatens the whole aircraft certification process
at the federal level," Ron Swanda of the General Aviation
Manufacturers Association said. "We could easily have states and state
juries coming up with their own airworthiness and pilot certification
requirements if federal pre-emption is not confirmed." The case
involves an airport worker who parked a truck on a runway to keep a
Piper Super Cub from taking off. The pilot was sitting in the rear seat
of the aircraft, which was designed for front-seat operation only, and
was filming himself and a glider he was towing when the aircraft hit the

truck, injuring the pilot. Piper was sued on the grounds that the aircraft was of tail-wheel design and did not provide adequate forward vision during take-off. A jury awarded a \$2.5 million judgment on the grounds the aircraft was unsafe. The FAA said it found the facts to be outrageous and that its expertise in certifying aircraft "should not be second-guessed by any court." Piper is expected to ask for a new trial.

--==--==--

the pilots here are extremely incensed over this. case appears to revolve around the certification for the Super Cub not including shoulder harnesses (later made a recommended retrofit option). pilot had mounted a camera into the front seat and was operating the aircraft from the back seat (against Piper specs). the airport owner had told the pilot this was unsafe and he had the runway blocked with a truck. the pilot attempted to take off anyway and the pilot hit the truck and hit his head on the camera (no harness..).

they feel that since the supremes didn't uphold federal preemption in this case, such preemption for other federal agencies can be called into question (say FCC or FDA rules..)....

Date: 14 Oct 93 19:56:58 GMT
From: ogicse!hp-cv!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!cupnews0.cup.hp.com!
jholly@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Aircraft Certification....Federal Preemption of State Rules.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM wrote:
: from an in-house newsletter here....also Aviation Week...

: Supreme Court turns down Piper-Cleveland case - Despite FAA
: intervention, the Supreme Court last week refused to hear the Piper-
: Cleveland case, which "threatens the whole aircraft certification process
: at the federal level," Ron Swanda of the General Aviation
: Manufacturers Association said. "We could easily have states and state
: juries coming up with their own airworthiness and pilot certification
: requirements if federal pre-emption is not confirmed." The case
: involves an airport worker who parked a truck on a runway to keep a
: Piper Super Cub from taking off. The pilot was sitting in the rear seat
: of the aircraft, which was designed for front-seat operation only, and
: was filming himself and a glider he was towing when the aircraft hit the
: truck, injuring the pilot. Piper was sued on the grounds that the aircraft
: was of tail-wheel design and did not provide adequate forward vision
: during take-off. A jury awarded a \$2.5 million judgment on the grounds
: the aircraft was unsafe. The FAA said it found the facts to be

: outrageous and that its expertise in certifying aircraft "should not be
: second-guessed by any court." Piper is expected to ask for a new trial.

: -==--==--==--

: the pilots here are extremely incensed over this. case appears to revolve
: around the certification for the Super Cub not including shoulder harnesses
: (later made a recommended retrofit option). pilot had mounted a camera into
: the front seat and was operating the aircraft from the back seat (against
: Piper specs). the airport owner had told the pilot this was unsafe and he
: had the runway blocked with a truck. the pilot attempted to take off anyway
: and the pilot hit the truck and hit his head on the camera (no harness..).

: they feel that since the supremes didn't uphold federal preemption in this
: case, such preemption for other federal agencies can be called into question
: (say FCC or FDA rules..)....

I think this is streaching things a bit. Can you say stupid jury and stupid
judge? Can you say incompetent lawyer? thought you could. This reminds me
of the case about the burgular that was breaking into a school and fell
through the skylight and then sued the school for his injuries. He won!

I think Piper better find a new lawyer. It is totally beyond comprehension
how this guy that was in violation of the certification, ignored the refit
instructions and then blantly ignored all warnings and took off into and
obviously dangerous situation could possibily have won anything other than a
stay in a mental ward.

Jim , WA6SDM
jholly@cup.hp.com

Date: 14 Oct 1993 17:53:33 GMT
From: w1gsl@athena.mit.edu
Subject: Commercial Operators Exams to be given at Hosstraders 16 Oct NH
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Commercial Radio Operator License Exams to be given at
Hosstraders Flea on October 16th

In a move similar to the well established Ham VEC system the
FCC has set up a system of Commercial Operator exams to be
administered by independent COLEM (commercial operator license
examination managers).

The MIT Radio Exam Team will conduct exams for the General

Radiotelephone Operators License and the Marine Radio Operators Permit. The exams will be held at 1PM Saturday October 16 at the Hosstraders Hamfest in Rochester NH. There is a \$35 examination fee. Bring the original and a copy of any commercial license you want to claim credit for. Also bring 2 forms of picture ID, a black pen and a pencil.

Copies of the question pool will be available for sale on Friday and Saturday morning.

The General Radio Telephone Operators License is required to service transmitters in the aviation, maritime and international radio services. A Maritime Radio Operators Permit is required to operate radiotelephone stations aboard large ships and certain aviation and coast stations.

At a later date exams will be available for the Commercial Radio Telegraph operators licenses and the Global Maritime Distress and Safety Systems (GMDSS) licenses. Amateur Extra Class operators may be particularly interested in obtaining a commercial telegraph license as they will receive credit for the 20 WPM 2nd class code exam.

A regular schedule of exams is planned for Cambridge MA.

The MIT Radio Exam Team operates under the auspices of the National Radio Examiners COLEM, part of the W5YI group.

```
*****
Steve Finberg          W1GSL          w1gsl@athena.mit.edu
PO Box 82 MIT Br       Cambridge MA 02139      617 258 3754
*****
```

Date: 14 Oct 1993 17:54:43 GMT
From: think.com!cayman!cuba!northup@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Getting my license. Do I want to be like this?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:
: In article <2530@indep1.UUCP> clifto@indep1.UUCP (Cliff Sharp) writes:
: >
: Bingo! The tests have never been a lid filter. To keep things orderly,
: we must *recruit* quality people, and we must *mentor* them once they're
: in. Like our friends here, many people pass their tests without ever
: meeting another amateur. (Well with the VE system they'll meet at least

: three.) So our *first* chance to steer these people in the right direction
: will likely be via an over the air contact.

I should point out that for many - like myself - the first contact is here
in rec.radio.amateur.....

You should use some of this bandwidth to help teach new hams what you would
like to see happen on the air, rather than debating code vs. no-code for
months.

: Gary

: --

: Gary Coffman KE4ZV	"If 10% is good enough	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
: Destructive Testing Systems	for Jesus, it's good	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
: 534 Shannon Way	enough for Uncle Sam."	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
: Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-Ray Stevens	

--

William Northup	
Project Manager	
Cayman Systems, Inc.	phone: (617) 494-1999
26 Landsdowne Street	fax: (617) 494-5167
Cambridge, MA 02139	Internet: northup@cayman.com

Date: 14 Oct 1993 19:47:30 GMT
From: noc.near.net!jericho.mc.com!fugu!levine@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Temporary ID's?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Its:

> /KT for any Technician - Not needed for no-code to code upgrade.
> /AG for General
> /AA for Advanced
> /AE for Extra
>

>In case you are wondering why Technician is "KT" and not "AT" like the rest
>is because "AT" is not a callsign prefix for United States. "KT" is.

>
>United states only has AAA to ALZ prefix block. "AT" is part of the block
>for India.
>

Wonder why they didn't use /WT, /WG, /WA, /WE. They are all in the US?

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #376
